## Key Elements of State PPP Enabling Legislation for Highway Projects Last Updated August 2006

No.:	Issue:	States with Provision:
1.	Does the relevant law allow solicited	Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware,
	and unsolicited proposals for PPP	Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland,
	Projects?	Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, North
		Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Virginia,
		Washington
2.	Does the relevant law permit	Alaska, Colorado, Delaware, Florida,
	local/state/federal funds to be	Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Nevada,
	combined with private sector funds	North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah,
	on a PPP project?	Virginia, Washington
3.	Who has rate-setting authority to	Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, California,
	impose user fees and under what	Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia,
	circumstances may they be changed	Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland,
	or otherwise reviewed?	Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, North
		Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas,
_		Utah, Virginia, Washington
4.	Does the relevant law permit TIFIA	Alaska, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana,
	loans to be used on PPP projects?	Louisiana, North Carolina, Oregon,
_		Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington
5.	Is the number of PPP projects	Alaska, Arizona, California, Indiana,
	limited to only a few "pilot" or	Missouri, North Carolina
	"demonstration" projects?	
6.	Are there restrictions concerning the	Alaska, California, Indiana, Missouri,
7	geographic location of PPP projects?	North Carolina
7.	Are there restrictions concerning the	Alabama, Arizona, California, Colorado,
	particular mode of transportation	Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri,
	eligible to be developed as a PPP project (e.g., truck, passenger auto,	Nevada, North Carolina, South Carolina
	freight rail, passenger rail)?	
8.	Is there a legal requirement to	North Carolina
0.	remove tolls after the repayment of	Troitii Carollila
	project debt?	
9.	Does the relevant law permit the	California, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana,
•	conversion of existing or partially	Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina,
	constructed highways into toll roads?	Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington
10.	Is there a restriction that prevents the	Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware,
	revenues from PPP projects from	Florida, Indiana, North Carolina, Oregon,
	being diverted to the state's general	Texas, Utah, Washington
	fund or for other unrelated uses?	, ,
11.	Is prior legislative approval required	Alaska, California, Delaware, Florida,
	when an individual PPP proposal is	Indiana, Louisiana, Washington
	received?	,,
12.	Are there any similar requirements	Arizona, Delaware, Minnesota
	J 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

No.:	Issue:	States with Provision:
	that subject the PPP proposal or the	
	negotiated PPP agreement to a local	
	veto?	
13.	Does the relevant law permit all	California, Colorado, Delaware, Georgia,
	kinds of procurements for PPP	Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri,
	project delivery? These might	North Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah,
	include, for example, calls for	Virginia, Washington
	projects, competitive RFQ and RFPs,	
	qualifications review followed by an	
	evaluation of proposer concepts, use	
	of design build, procurements based	
	on financial terms such as return on	
	equity rather than on price, long-	
	term asset leases for some period of up to 60 years or longer from the	
	time operations commence?	
14.	Are there explicit	Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana,
17.	exemptions/supplemental	Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon,
	procurement authority from the	Virginia, Washington
	application of the state's general	viiginia, vi asimigeon
	procurement laws?	
15.	Does the relevant law authorize the	Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California,
	public sector to grant long-term	Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia,
	leases/franchises for the	Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland,
	construction, operation and	Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, North
	maintenance of toll facilities?	Carolina, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Virginia,
		Washington
16.	Does the public sector have the	Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Indiana,
	authority to issue toll revenue bonds	Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, North
	or notes?	Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas,
		Utah, Washington
17.	Does the public sector have the	Colorado, Georgia, Oregon, South
	authority to form nonprofits and let	Carolina, Virginia
	them issue debt on behalf of a public	
18.	agency?  Does the relevant public agency have	Alaska Colorado Florida Consis
10.	the authority to hire its own technical	Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Maryland, North Carolina,
	and legal consultants?	Oregon, Texas, Utah, Virginia,
	and regar constituits:	Washington
19.	Does the relevant law permit the	Delaware, Indiana, Texas
17.	public sector to make payments to	2 cm. are, marana, 10mas
	unsuccessful bidders for work	
	product contained in their proposals?	
20.	Can the agency charge application	Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana,
	fees to offset its proposal review	Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon,

No.:	Issue:	States with Provision:
	costs?	Texas, Virginia, Washington
21.	Does the relevant law allow adequate time for the preparation, submission and evaluation of competitive proposals? Note that the agency should have the authority to establish these deadlines on a case-by-case basis depending on the complexity and scope of the initial proposal or other factors that might promote competition (e.g., more review time	Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, Washington
22.	during holiday periods).  Is the public sector required to maintain comparable non-toll routes when it establishes new toll roads?	Arizona, North Carolina
23.	Are there any non-compete clause prohibitions?	Alabama, North Carolina
24.	Is the authority to enter into PPPs restricted to the state DOT or state turnpike authority or may regional or local entities also do so?	Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, Washington (States listed restrict authority to state DOT or state turnpike authority.)
25.	Does the relevant law specify evaluation criteria for PPP proposals received under a given procurement approach?	Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Nevada, Virginia
26.	Does the relevant law specify the structure and participants for the review process involving PPP proposals?	California, Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Oregon, Utah, Washington
27.	Does the relevant law protect the confidentiality of PPP proposals and any related negotiations in the period prior to execution of the PPP agreement?	Delaware, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, Washington
28.	Does the relevant law provide for the ability of the public sector to outsource long-term operations and maintenance and other asset management duties to the private sector?	Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington